

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-2360**

---

ODELL COLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM A. HALTER, Acting Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Charles B. Day, Magistrate Judge. (CA-99-  
3529-AMD)

---

Submitted: April 30, 2001

Decided: May 16, 2001

---

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stephen F. Shea, WILLONER, CALABRESE & ROSEN, P.A., College Park,  
Maryland, for Appellant. Stephen M. Schenning, United States At-  
torney, Ariana Wright Arnold, Assistant United States Attorney,  
Charlotte J. Hardnett, Acting General Counsel, Frank V. Smith III,  
Acting Principal Deputy General Counsel, John M. Sacchetti,  
Associate General Counsel for Program Litigation, Etzion Brand,  
Supervisory Attorney, Retirement Survivors Supplemental Assistance  
Litigation Branch, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Baltimore,  
Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Odell Coley appeals the magistrate judge's order\* granting the Commissioner of Social Security's motion for summary judgment and affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits. We have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs, the joint appendix, and the administrative record and find no reversible error in the Commissioner's finding that Coley was not entitled to benefits because the onset date of his disability occurred after his insured status had expired. Furthermore, contrary to Coley's assertion that the administrative law judge should have further developed the record because Coley was not represented by counsel at the administrative hearing, we find that further development was unnecessary. See Flaten v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs., 44 F.3d 1453, 1458 (9th Cir. 1995) (holding that claimant cannot receive benefits for recurrence of disability, if current period of disability began after expiration of insured status).

Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the magistrate judge. Coley v. Halter, No. CA-99-3529-AMD (D. Md. Aug. 21, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

---

\* The parties consented to the exercise of jurisdiction by the magistrate judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(c)(1) (West 1993 & Supp. 2000).

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED